arXiv:1412.3676v5 [quant-ph] 5 Jun 2016

On single-copy maximization of measured f-divergence between a given pair of quantum states

Keiji Matsumoto
National Institute of Informatics,
2-1-2, Hitotsubashi, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8430
keiji@nii.ac.jp

June 7, 2016

Abstract

This paper deals with (single-copy) maximization of classical f-divergence, which is a generalization of Kullback-Leibler divergence and Renyi-type relative entropy, of the distributions of measurement outputs of a given pair of quantum states. So far, there had been significant development concerning asymptotic maximization, or maximizing rate of the quantity when collective measurements are performed on large number of copies of states. On the other hand, however, relatively little has been done about single-copy maximization, and the question is solved only for very restricted examples of f. The pourpose of the present paper is to push forward the research by investigating the properties of the maximized f-divergence, and rewriting the maximization problem to more tractable form. The consequences of these efforts include an expression of the maximized quantity by "non-commutative Radon-Nikodym derivative", and closed formulas of the quantity in some special cases, e.g., when the first argument is a pure state,or f is in some specific form.

1 Introduction and summary of results

This paper deals with (single-copy) maximization of classical f-divergence between the distributions of a measurement outputs of a given pair of quantum states. f-divergence D_f between the probability density functions p_1 and p_2 over a discrete set is defined as

$$D_f\left(p_1||p_2\right) := \sum_x p_2\left(x\right) f\left(\frac{p_1\left(x\right)}{p_2\left(x\right)}\right),$$

if $p_2(x) > 0$ for all x. (The definition for the general case is given later.)

This problem is import since D_f has good operational meanings. For example, $f_{\mathrm{KL}}(\lambda) := \lambda \ln \lambda$ correspond to Kullback-Leibler divergence. Also,

$$f_\alpha(\lambda) := \mathrm{sign}((\alpha - 1)\alpha) \cdot \lambda^\alpha. \tag{1}$$

is essentially Rnyi-type relative entropy. (Here $\mathrm{sign}(c)$ is either 1 or -1 depending on c is non-negative or negative, $\mathrm{sign}(c) = c/|c|$.)They play key role in the theory of large deviation, and thus extensively used in asymptotic analysis of error probability of decoding, hypothesis test, and so on.

Other f-divergences than these have at least one operational meaning. If f is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function whose domain contains positive half-line, $D_f(p_1||p_2)$ is the optimal gain of a certain Bayes decision problem. In other words, for each f satisfying above mentioned conditions, there is a pair of real valued functions w_1 and w_2 on decision space representing a gain of decision d, with

$$D_f(p_1||p_2) = \sup_{d(\cdot)} \sum_x \left(w_1(d(x))\, p_1(x) + w_2(d(x))\, p_2(x)\right). \tag{2}$$

Conversely, for each $\vec{w}(\cdot) = (w_1(\cdot), w_2(\cdot))$, there is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function f satisfying the above identity. Also, by (2) and the celebrated randomization criterion [13][14], there is a Markov map which sends (p, q) to (p', q') if and only if $D_f(p||q) \geq D_f(p'||q')$ holds for any convex function f .

In quantum information and quantum statistics, finding the optimal measured f-divergence $D_f^{\min}$ is of interest:

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) := \sup_{M:\mathrm{POVM}} D_f\left(P_{\rho_1}^M||P_{\rho_2}^M\right),$$

where POVM is the short for positive operator valued measures, and $P_{\rho_\theta}^M$ is the probability distribution obtained by application of the measurement M to the state ρ_θ ($\theta \in \{1, 2\}$). (Underlying Hilbert space is finite dimensional throughout the paper.) However, calculation of $D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2)$, being maximization of nonlinear functional of POVM, is far from tractable. Thus, so far, most of the works are devoted to asymptotic analysis: for example, in their celebrated paper [7], Hiai and Petz showed that the asymptotic limit $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} D_{f_{\mathrm{KL}}}^{\min}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)$ equals Umegaki-von Neumann type relative entropy. In [8][5], they computed similar quantity for f_α.

However, if we turn to single-copy optimization, the problem had been so far solved only for $f_{1/2}$, and $f(\lambda) = |1 - \lambda|$, which corresponds to fidelity and statistical distance, respectively. Single-copy maximization is aso important, firstly because collective measurements are technologically highly demanding, and secondly because comparison between signle-conpy maximum and asymptotic one signifies the effectivenss of collective measurements. Also, detailed knowledge of single copy maximum may give deeper understanding of asymptotic theory.

A purpose of the present paper is to advance the study of exact (not asymptotic) optimization, by rewriting the maximization problem to more tractable form, and giving closed formulas of the quantity in some special cases. Our main mathematical tool is convex analysis, and we exploit the observation (2), or that f-divergence is supremum of linear functional.

One of the two main results in this direction is Theorem 18: if the convex conjugate f^* of f is operator convex, $D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2)$ is written as the supremum of a concave function of a Hermitian operator *without* extending the underlying Hilbert space, namely,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \sup\left\{\operatorname{tr}\rho_1 T - \operatorname{tr}\rho_2 f^*(T)\,;\operatorname{spec} T \subset \operatorname{dom} f^*\right\}.$$

With some additional assumptions on f, this further can be rewritten as

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \operatorname{tr}\rho_2 f\left(f^{*\prime}(T_0)\right),$$

where, denoting the Frechet derivative of f^* by $\mathrm{D}f^*$, T_0 is a solution to the matrix equation

$$\rho_1 = \mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\rho_2).$$

This equation is straight forwardly solved if $f = f_2$ and f_{-1}, resulting in closed formla of the quantity in each case.

The other main result is Theorem 25, which simplifies the optimization when ρ_1 has non-trivial kernel: if f^* is operator convex, $\operatorname{dom} f^*$ is unbounded from below, one can reduce the optimization problem to the one in $\operatorname{supp}\rho_1$, namely,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\pi_{\rho_1}\rho_2\pi_{\rho_1}) + f(0)\left(1 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_2\pi_{\rho_1}\right),$$

where π_{ρ_1} is the projection onto $\operatorname{supp}\rho_1$. If ρ_1 is a pure state, $\rho_1 = |\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|$, this is gives closed formula,

$$D_f^{\min}(|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|\,||\rho_2) = \langle\varphi_1|\rho_2|\varphi_1\rangle f\left(\frac{1}{\langle\varphi_1|\rho_2|\varphi_1\rangle}\right) + f(0)\left(1 - \langle\varphi_1|\rho_2|\varphi_1\rangle\right).$$

Using above results, we analyze $D_f^{\min}$ of infinitesimally close two staes, up to the second order of the distance between them:

$$\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{(\eta'-\eta)^2}D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta'}),$$

where $\{\rho_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$ is a family of parameterized states and f has good properties. It have been a folklore that this limit equals the constant multiple of SLD (symmetric logarithmic derivative) Fisher information, which plays an important role in the asymptotic theory of statistics. We prove the folklore in the case where ρ_η 's rank is either full or one, and disprove it in other cases, giving the alternative correct formula (40).

2 Classical f-divergence

In this section, we summarize known facts about classical f-divergence and convex functions. As in [10], we suppose that f is a map from $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}\cup\{\pm\infty\}$. Instead of saying that f is not defined on a certain set, we say that $f(\lambda)=\infty$ on that set.

Definition 1 *The effective domain of f, denoted by* $\operatorname{dom} f$ *, is the set of all λ's with $f(\lambda)<\infty$. f is a convex function if and only if its epigraph, or the set*

$$\operatorname{epi} f := \{(\lambda_1,\lambda_2);\lambda_2 \geq f(\lambda_1)\}$$

is convex. A function f is proper if and only if f is nowhere $-\infty$ and not ∞ everywhere, and is lower semi-continuous if and only if the set $\{\lambda_1;\lambda_2\geq f(\lambda_1)\}$ is closed for any λ_2. Given a convex functionion f, its lower semi-continuous hull is a greatest lower semi-continuous function (not necessarily finite) majorized by f.

Remark 2 *An improper convex function, being necessarily infinite except perhaps at relative boundary points of its effective doimain (Theorem 7.2 of [10]), rarely appears in application.*

Lemma 3 *(Theorem 7.1 of [10]) A proper convex function f is lower semi-continuous if and only if its epigraph is closed. Given a convex functionion f, its lower semi-continuous hull always exists, and coincide with f except perhaps at the relative boundary points of its effective domain. The epigraph of the lower semi-continuous hull is the closure of the epigraph of f.*

Lemma 4 *(Corollary 13.5.1 of [10]) If f is proper and lower semi-continuous and convex, it is the pointwise supremum of linear functions.*

From here, unless otherwise mentioned, functions denoted by f, f_α etc are a proper lower semi-continuous convex function on $\mathbb{R}$, and its effective domain contains $(0,\infty)$. For a given f, f-divergence $D_f(P_1||P_2)$ between positive finite measures P_1 and P_2 is defined as follows.

Definition 5 *Let p_1 and p_2 be density function of P_1 and P_2 with respect to a measure μ which dominates them. (Such a measure μ always exists. For example, one may choose $\mu=P_1+P_2$.) When p_1 and p_2 have the common support (e.g. the set where they are positive),*

$$D_f(P_1||P_2) := \int_{\operatorname{supp} p_2} p_2(x)\, f\left(\frac{p_1(x)}{p_2(x)}\right) \mathrm{d}\mu(x).$$

(This definition seemingly depends on the choice of μ, but in fact it does not.) When their supports are not identical, we extend D_f so that the function $(P_1,P_2)\to D_f(P_1||P_2)$ is the pointwise supremum of linear functions:

$$D_f(P_1||P_2) := \int g(p_1(x), p_2(x))\, \mathrm{d}\mu(x),$$

where $g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ is the lower semi-continuous hull of $\lambda_2 f\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right)$, or more explicitly (see p. 35 and p.67 of [10]),

$$g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := \begin{cases} \lambda_2 f\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right), & \text{if } \lambda_1 \in \operatorname{dom} f, \lambda_2 > 0 \\ \lim_{\lambda_2 \downarrow 0} \lambda_2 f\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}\right), & \text{if } \lambda_1 \in \operatorname{dom} f,\ \lambda_2 = 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0, \\ \infty, & \text{if } \lambda_1 \notin \operatorname{dom} f \quad \text{or } \lambda_2 < 0. \end{cases}$$

That the function $(P_1, P_2) \to D_f(P_1||P_2)$ defined above is the pointwise supremum of linear functions is proved as follows. Since g is proper and lower semi-continuous and convex, by Lemma 4, it is the pointwise supremum of linear functions,

$$g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \sup_{\vec{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{\theta \in \{1,2\}} w_\theta \lambda_\theta, \tag{3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{W}_f := \left\{ \vec{w} = (w_\theta)_{\theta \in \{1,2\}}; w_1 \le w_1',\ w_2 \le -f^*(w_1'), \exists w_1' \in \operatorname{dom} f^* \right\},$$

and f^* is convex conjugate of f,

$$f^*(t) := \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} (t\lambda - f(\lambda)).$$

Therefore, as will be explained below,

$$\begin{aligned} & D_f(P_1||P_2) \\ &= \int \left(\sup_{\vec{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{\theta \in \{1,2\}} w_\theta p_\theta(x) \right) \mathrm{d}\mu(x) \\ &= \sup \left\{ \int \sum_{\theta \in \{1,2\}} w_\theta(x) p_\theta(x) \, \mathrm{d}\mu(x); \vec{w}(\cdot) : \text{ bounded, measurable, into } \mathcal{W}_f \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Thus we have the assertion. Here, the second identity above holds since the function

$$x \to \sup_{\vec{w} \in \mathcal{W}} \sum_{\theta \in \{1,2\}} w_\theta p_\theta(x)$$

is meaureable, and any measureable function is aribtrarily approximated by a simple function, which is bounded.

Remark 6 *Since g is in addition positively homogeneous, or*

$$\forall a \ge 0,\ g(a\lambda_1, a\lambda_2) = a g(\lambda_1, \lambda_2),$$

it is obvious that the value of D_f does not depends on the choice of μ, despite its apparent dependency on μ.

Remark 7 *(4) indicates (2).To see this, use $\mathcal{W}_f$ as a decision space, and let the the gain of the decision $\vec{w}$ be w_θ when true probability distribution is P_θ.*

Remark 8 *If $p_2(x) = 0$ and $p_1(x) > 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} g(p_1(x), p_2(x)) &= \lim_{\lambda_2 \downarrow 0} \lambda_2 f\left(\frac{p_1(x)}{\lambda_2}\right), \\ &= p_1(x) \lim_{\lambda_2' \downarrow 0} \lambda_2' f\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_2'}\right), \end{aligned}$$

and if $p_1(x) = 0$ and $p_2(x) = 0$, $g(p_1(x), p_2(x)) = 0$. Thus,

$$D_f(P_1||P_2) = \int_{\operatorname{supp} p_2} p_2(x) f\left(\frac{p_1(x)}{p_2(x)}\right) \mathrm{d}\mu(x) + P_1(\{x; p_2(x) = 0, p_1(x) \neq 0\}) \lim_{\lambda_2 \downarrow 0} \lambda_2 f\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_2}\right).$$

The correspondence between D_f and $\mathcal{W}_f$ is one-to-one, but the one between $\mathcal{W}_f$ and f is not, since only monotone increasing part of f^* is relavant in the definition of $\mathcal{W}_f$, or equivalently, the values of f in the negative half line does not affect the value of D_f.

Definition 9 *A convex function f on $\mathbb{R}$ is canonical if f^* is strictly monotone increasing on* $\operatorname{dom} f^*$*. If f^* is not canonical, we define its "canonicalization" f_0 by*

$$f_0^*(t) := \begin{cases} f^*(t), & \text{if } \forall t' > t,\ f^*(t') > f^*(t), \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recall that f used in the definition of f-divergence is not always $+\infty$ on the positive half line. Therefore, $\operatorname{dom} f_0^*$ is not empty.

Denoting by f_+' the right derivative of f, in fact we have

$$f_0(\lambda) = \begin{cases} f(\lambda), & \text{if } \lambda \geq 0, \\ f_+'(0)\, t + f(0), & \text{if } \lambda < 0. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

if $f_+'(0)$ is finite, and

$$f_0(\lambda) = \begin{cases} f(\lambda), & \text{if } \lambda \geq 0, \\ +\infty, & \text{if } \lambda < 0, \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

otherwise. In addition, t_0 is the largest lower bound to $\operatorname{dom} f_0^*$

$$t_0 = f_+'(0), \tag{7}$$

where

$$t_0 := \inf\{t; t \in \operatorname{dom} f_0^*\}.$$

(If $\operatorname{dom} f_0^*$ is not bounded from below, $t_0 := -\infty$.) By definition of f_0^*,

$$\inf_t f(t) = \inf_t f^*(t) = f(t_0). \tag{8}$$

The proof of (5), (6) and (7) are given in Appendix A.

For example, both of

$$f_{\mathrm{TV}}(\lambda) := |1-\lambda|,$$
$$\widetilde{f}_{\mathrm{TV}}(\lambda) := \begin{cases} |1-\lambda|, & \lambda \geq 0, \\ \infty, & \lambda < 0, \end{cases}$$

correspond to the total variation distance,

$$D_{f_{\mathrm{TV}}}(P||Q) = D_{\widetilde{f}_{\mathrm{TV}}}(P||Q) = \|P-Q\|_1 .$$

The former is canonical but the latter is not,

$$f^*_{\mathrm{TV}}(t) = \begin{cases} \infty, & t < -1, \\ t, & -1 \leq t \leq 1, \\ \infty, & t > 1, \end{cases},$$
$$\widetilde{f}^*_{\mathrm{TV}}(t) = \begin{cases} -1, & t < -1, \\ t, & -1 \leq t \leq 1, \\ \infty, & t > 1, \end{cases}.$$

Definition 10 *Define*

$$\hat{f}(\lambda) := g(1,\lambda),\ \lambda \geq 0,$$

and canonically extend it to the negative half line. Also, define $\hat{g}$ by in a parallel manner as the definition of g, replacing f by $\hat{f}$.

By definition,

$$\hat{g}(\lambda_1,\lambda_2) = g(\lambda_2,\lambda_1), \tag{9}$$

holds for all $\lambda_1 \geq 0$: if $\lambda_1 \in \operatorname{dom}\hat{f}$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, the relation is checked by easy computation. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$, the both ends of (9) is 0. Finally, if $\lambda_1 = 0 \notin \operatorname{dom}\hat{f}$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$,

$$\hat{g}(0,\lambda_2) = \infty = \hat{f}(0) = \lambda_2 \hat{f}(0) = \lambda_2 g(1,0) = g(\lambda_2,0),$$

and the relation is checked.(9) means

$$D_f(P_1||P_2) = D_{\hat{f}}(P_2||P_1).$$

3 Expressions of $D_f^{\min}$ (I)

Consider density operators $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\{1,2\}}$ over finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ (throughout the paper, Hilbert spaces are always finite dimensional) .

Definition 11

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) := \sup_{M:POVM} D_f\left(P^M_{\rho_1}||P^M_{\rho_2}\right), \tag{10}$$

where POVM is the short for positive operator valued measures, and $P_{\rho_\theta}^M$ is the probability distribution resulting from application of the measurement M to the state ρ_θ ($\theta \in \{1,2\}$).

The notation $D_f^{\min}$ comes from the following fact. If D_f^Q is a real valued function of $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\{1,2\}}$ which coincide with D_f on any commutative subalgebra and is monotone non-increasing by application of completely positive trace preserving (CPTP) maps, then

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) \leq D_f^Q(\rho_1||\rho_2). \tag{11}$$

since, by definition of $D_f^{\min}$, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a measurement M such that

$$\begin{aligned} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) - \varepsilon &\leq D_f\left(P_{\rho_1}^M||P_{\rho_2}^M\right) \\ &= D_f^Q\left(P_{\rho_1}^M||P_{\rho_2}^M\right) \\ &\leq D_f^Q(\rho_1||\rho_2). \end{aligned}$$

For the sake of notational simplicity, we extend D_f and $D_f^{\min}$ to all the positive finite measures and all the positive operators.

Denote also by $p_{\rho_\theta}^M$ the density of $P_{\rho_1}^M$ with respect to an underlying measure μ^M, which may be taken as $P_{\rho_1}^M + P_{\rho_2}^M$. Using (4),

$$\begin{aligned} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= \sup_{\vec{w}(\cdot),M} \int \sum_{\theta\in\{1,2\}} w_\theta(x)\, p_{\rho_\theta}^M(x)\, \mathrm{d}\mu^M(x) \\ &= \sup_{\vec{w}(\cdot),M} \int \sum_{\theta\in\{1,2\}} w_\theta(x)\, \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\theta M(\mathrm{d}x) \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{w}(\cdot)$ moves all over the simple functions into $\mathcal{W}_f$. By defining a new POVM $M'(B) := M\left(\vec{w}^{-1}(B)\right)$,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \sup_M \int_{\mathcal{W}_f} \sum_{\theta\in\{1,2\}} w_\theta \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\theta M(\mathrm{d}\vec{w}).$$

Since the functional

$$M \to \int_{\mathcal{W}_f} \sum_{\theta\in\{1,2\}} w_\theta \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\theta M(\mathrm{d}\vec{w})$$

is affine, by Caratheodory's theorem, the support of M can be reduced to a finite set without changing the supremum. (The cardinality of $\mathrm{supp}\, M$ may be less than or equal to $(\dim\mathcal{H})^2 + 2$.) Thus taking μ as the counting measure, we have

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \sup_M \sum_{\vec{w}\in\mathrm{supp}\, M} \sum_{\theta\in\{1,2\}} w_\theta\, \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\theta M_{\vec{w}}. \tag{12}$$

In taking supremum, without loss of generality, we may restrict the support of M to the boundary of $\mathcal{W}_f$. Thus,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \sup_M \sum_{t\in \operatorname{supp} M} \{t \operatorname{tr}\rho_1 M_t - f^*(t) \operatorname{tr}\rho_2 M_t\}, \tag{13}$$

$$= \sup_M \sum_{s\in \operatorname{supp} M} \left\{-\hat{f}^*(s)\ \operatorname{tr}\rho_1 M_s + s\operatorname{tr}\rho_2 M_s\right\}, \tag{14}$$

where $\operatorname{supp} M$ in (13) and (14) is a finite subset of $\operatorname{dom} f^*$ and $\operatorname{dom} \hat{f}^*$, respectively.

4 Necessary and sufficient conditions for $D_f^{\min} < \infty$

In this section we determine the case where $D_f^{\min}$ stays finite. Note this result also give, due to (11), the necessary (and in fact , sufficient) condition that all the quantum versions of f-divergence becomes finite.

Definition 12 *Define b_* (,b'_*, resp.) as the smallest number with $\rho_1 - b_*\rho_2 \le 0$ (, the largest number with $\rho_1 - b'_*\rho_2 \ge 0$). When such b_* does not exist, we let $b_* := \infty$. Let t_* (t'_*, resp.) be the largest (smallest, resp.) number such that b_* (b'_*, resp.) is a subgradient of f^* at t_* (t'_*, resp.). If $b_* = \infty$ ($b'_* = 0$, resp.), we define t_* as the smallest upper bound to* $\operatorname{dom} f^*$ *(t'_* as the largest lower bound to* $\operatorname{dom} f^*$*, resp.).*

If $b_* < \infty$ ($b_* > 0$, resp.), such t_* (t'_*, resp.) exists, since the effective domain of $f^{**} = f$, or equivalently the range of the subgradient, contains $(0,\infty)$ ($(0,\infty) \subset \operatorname{dom} f$ is supposed throughout the paper, as stated in Section 2). By definition, $b_* \ge b'_*$ and $t_* \ge t'_*$.

Observe, by definition of the subgradient and convexity of f^*,

$$t \le t'_* \Rightarrow f^*(t'_*) - f^*(t) \le b'_*(t'_* - t),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &t \ge t_* \Rightarrow f^*(t) - f^*(t_*) \ge b_*(t - t_*) \\ &\Leftrightarrow f^*(t_*) - f^*(t) \le b_*(t_* - t). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for all $t \le t'_*$

$$\begin{aligned} &\{t'_*\rho_1 - f^*(t'_*)\rho_2\} - \{t\rho_1 - f^*(t)\rho_2\} \\ &\ge (t'_* - t)\{\rho_1 - b'_*\rho_2\} \ge 0, \end{aligned}$$

and for all $t \ge t_*$,w

$$\begin{aligned} &\{t_*\rho_1 - f^*(t_*)\rho_2\} - \{t\rho_1 - f^*(t)\rho_2\} \\ &\ge (t_* - t)\{\rho_1 - b_*\rho_2\} \ge 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, concentration of the support of M on $[t'_*, t_*]$ does not decrease the sum

$$\sum_{t \in \operatorname{supp} M} \operatorname{tr} \{t\, \rho_1 - f^*(t)\, \rho_2\}\, M_t.$$

In other words, we can suppose

$$\operatorname{supp} M \subset [t'_*, t_*]\,. \tag{15}$$

First suppose $\operatorname{supp} \rho_1 = \operatorname{supp} \rho_2$. In this case, $b_* < \infty$ and $b'_* > 0$. Thus, t_* and t'_* are finite. Therefore,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 || \rho_2) \leq t_* - f^*(t'_*) < \infty.$$

Next, we study the case where $\operatorname{supp} \rho_1 \subset \operatorname{supp} \rho_2$ and $\ker \rho_1 \neq \{0\}$. Let π be the projection onto $\ker \rho_1$. Then by (12),

$$\begin{aligned} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 || \rho_2) &\geq w_1 \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 \pi + w_2 \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 \pi + w'_1 \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 (\mathbf{1} - \pi) + w'_2 \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 (\mathbf{1} - \pi) \\ &= w_2 \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 \pi + w'_1 \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 (\mathbf{1} - \pi) + w'_2 \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 (\mathbf{1} - \pi) \end{aligned}$$

holds for any any $\vec{w}$, $\vec{w}' \in \mathcal{W}_f$. Therefore, $D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 || \rho_2)$ can be finite only if w_2 stays finite, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{W}_f \subset \mathbb{R} \times (-\infty, a_2]. \tag{16}$$

On the other hand, suppose the above inclusion is true. Since $\operatorname{supp} \rho_1 \subset \operatorname{supp} \rho_2$, $b_* > 0$ and t_* is finite. Therefore, by (15) and (16),

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 || \rho_2) \leq t_* + a_2 < \infty.$$

Exchanging the role of w_1 and w_2, thus replacing f^* and (16) by $\hat{f}^*$ and

$$\mathcal{W}_f \subset (-\infty, a_1] \times \mathbb{R}, \tag{17}$$

respectively, the case where $\operatorname{supp} \rho_2 \subset \operatorname{supp} \rho_1$ and $\ker \rho_2 \neq \{0\}$ is almost analogously analyzed.

Finally, suppose $\operatorname{supp} \rho_1 \not\subset \operatorname{supp} \rho_2$ and $\operatorname{supp} \rho_2 \not\subset \operatorname{supp} \rho_1$. Then by the argument almost parallel to the one used to show

$$D_f^{\min} < \infty \Rightarrow (16),$$

$D_f^{\min}$ is finite only if there are finite numbers a_1 and a_2 with

$$\mathcal{W}_f \subset (-\infty, a_1] \times (-\infty, a_2]. \tag{18}$$

(This is the case if $\operatorname{dom} f^*$ is a finite interval.) On the other hand, if this condition is true, by (4),

$$D_f(P_1 || P_2) \leq \max\{a_1, a_2\} < \infty.$$

To summarize:

Theorem 13 *Suppose f is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function with* $\mathrm{dom}\, f \supset (0,\infty)$. *Then,* $D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) < \infty$ *holds if* $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 = \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$. *Also,* $D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) < \infty$ *is equivalent to (18) if* $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 \not\subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$ *and* $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2 \not\subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1$ *hold, to (16) if* $\mathrm{supp}\rho_1 \subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$ *and* $\ker\rho_1 \neq \{0\}$ *hold, and to (17) if* $\mathrm{supp}\rho_2 \subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1$ *and* $\ker\rho_2 \neq \{0\}$ *hold.*

Note (16) and (17) is equivalent to

$$f^*(-\infty) > -\infty$$

and

$$\mathrm{dom}\, f^* \subset (-\infty, a_1],$$

respectively.

As proved in Appendix B, one can in fact show:

Theorem 14 *Suppose f is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function with* $\mathrm{dom}\, f \supset (0,\infty)$. *Suppose also D_f^Q is a real valued function of $\{\rho_\theta\}_{\theta\in\{1,2\}}$ which coincide with D_f on any commutative subalgebra and is monotone non-increasing by application of CPTP maps. Then,* $D_f^Q(\rho_1||\rho_2) < \infty$ *holds if* $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 = \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$. *Also,* $D_f^Q(\rho_1||\rho_2) < \infty$ *is equivalent to (18) if* $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 \not\subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$ *and* $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2 \not\subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1$ *hold, to (16) if* $\mathrm{supp}\rho_1 \subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$ *and* $\ker\rho_1 \neq \{0\}$ *hold, and to (17) if* $\mathrm{supp}\rho_2 \subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1$ *and* $\ker\rho_2 \neq \{0\}$ *hold.*

5 Continuity of $D_f^{\min}$ and other versions of quantum f-divergence

Since $D_f^{\min}$ is jointly convex almost by definition, it is continuous in the interior of $\mathrm{dom}\, D_f^{\min}$, or at the points where $\rho_1 > 0$ and $\rho_2 > 0$. By applying well-known facts in convex analysis, a weak version of "continuity at the boundary" is easily proved.

Lemma 15 *$D_f^{\min}$ is a proper lower semi-continuous convex function which is positively homogeneous.*

Proof. Rewrite (12) as

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \sup_M h_M(\rho_1,\rho_2),$$

where

$$h_M(\rho_1,\rho_2) := \sup_M \sum_{\vec{w}\in\mathrm{supp}\, M} \sum_{\theta\in\{1,2\}} w_\theta \,\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\theta M_{\vec{w}},$$

and M moves for all over the POVM's whose support is a finite set in $\mathcal{W}_f$. That $D_f^{\min}$ is proper, convex, and positively homogeneous is obvious from this expression. Also, recall that lower semi-continuity is equivallent to closed epigraph.

Thus, lower semi-continuity of $D_f^{\min}$ follows from

$$\bigcap_M \operatorname{epi} h_M = \operatorname{epi} D_f^{\min}$$

and closedness of $\operatorname{epi} h_M$. ■

Theorem 16 *For any $\rho_1 \geq 0$ and $\rho_2 \geq 0$, and for any $X_1, X_2 \geq 0$,*

$$\lim_{s \downarrow 0} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 + sX_1 || \rho_2 + sX_2) = D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 || \rho_2). \tag{19}$$

Proof. Since $D_f^{\min}$ is lower semicontinuous, it is continuous on any (finite dimensional) simplex inside $\operatorname{dom} D_f^{\min}$ by Theorem 10.2 of [10]. Applying this fact to the line segment connecting $(\rho_1 + sX_1, \rho_2 + sX_2)$ and (ρ_1, ρ_2), we have the assertion. ■

Remark 17 *In may literature, various versions qunatum version of f-divergences D_f^Q's are defined for strictly positive operators, and then extended to general positive operators (possibly with eigenvalue 0) in certain manners, and analogues of (19) are proved exploiting various properties of each D_f^Q.*

However, so far the author had observed, these extensions are all closure of D_f^Q : given D_f^Q whose effective domain $\operatorname{dom} D_f^Q$ is strictly positive operators, choose $\tilde{D}_f^Q$ by $\operatorname{epi} \tilde{D}_f^Q = \operatorname{cl}\left(\operatorname{epi} D_f^Q\right)$. For such an extension, analogue of (19) holds, by Theorem 10.2 of [10].

By unique existence of the closure, analogue of (19) with some fixed $X_1 > 0$, $X_2 > 0$ (they can be identity) can be used to define $\tilde{D}_f^Q$. Then (19) for all $X_1 \geq 0$, $X_2 \geq 0$, convexity, and positive homogeneity holds.

6 Expressions of $D_f^{\min}$ (II)

In this section and in the most part of the remainder of the paper, we suppose at least one of the followings is true.

(I) f^* is operator convex on $\operatorname{dom} f^*$

(II) $\hat{f}^*(t)$ $(= -f^{*-1}(-t))$ is operator convex on $\operatorname{dom} \hat{f}^*$

By (13) and Naimark's extension theorem,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1 || \rho_2) = \sup_{E,V} \sum_{t \in \operatorname{supp} E} \left\{ t \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 V^\dagger E_t V - f^*(t) \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 V^\dagger E_t V \right\},$$

where E is a projection valued measure (PVM, in short) on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{K} \supset \mathcal{H}$, and V is an isometry from $\mathcal{H}$ into $\mathcal{K}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= \sup_{E,V} \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 V^\dagger \sum_{t \in \operatorname{supp} E} t\, E_t V - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 V^\dagger \sum_{t \in \operatorname{supp} E} f^*(t)\, E_t V \right\} \\ &= \sup_{T,V} \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 V^\dagger T V - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 V^\dagger f^*(T) V \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where T is a self-adjoint operator on the extended Hilbert space $\mathcal{K}$ with $\operatorname{spec} T \subset \operatorname{dom} f^*$. Here, suppose (I) holds. Then by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &\le \sup_{T,V} \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 V^\dagger T V - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 f^*\left(V^\dagger T V\right) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{T,V} \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 V^\dagger T V - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 f^*\left(V^\dagger T V\right) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{T'} \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 T' - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 f^*(T') \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last end, T' is a self-adjoint operator on the original Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with $\operatorname{spec} T' \subset \operatorname{dom} f^*$. The opposite inequality is easily obtained by restricting the measurements in (13) to PVM. Thus,

$$D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) = \sup \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 T - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 f^*(T) ; \operatorname{spec} T \subset \operatorname{dom} f^* \right\} \tag{20}$$

$$= \sup \left\{ \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 f^{*-1}(S) - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 S ; \operatorname{spec} S \subset \operatorname{dom} f^{*-1} \right\}. \tag{21}$$

The second identity is obtained by putting $S := -f^*(T)$. (Recall f^* is monotone in its effective domain.) By assuming (II) and using (14), we can also obtain the same identity. Summarizing the above argument:

Theorem 18 *Let f be a proper convex function with $\operatorname{dom} f \supset (0, \infty)$. If either (I) or (II) is true, we have (20) and (21).*

As we analyze later, f_α ($\alpha \le \frac{1}{2}$) and f_{KL_2} are the examples where (I) holds, and f_α ($\alpha \ge \frac{1}{2}$) and f_{KL} are the examples where (II) holds.

7 The stationary point

Throughout this section, unless otherwise mentioned, we suppose that the condition (I) holds. This means that

$$G(T) := \operatorname{tr} \rho_1 T - \operatorname{tr} \rho_2 f^*(T) \tag{22}$$

is concave in T, and its supremum equals $D_f^{\min}$. Moreover, we focus on an easy case where the stationary point T_0 of G, or T_0 with $\mathrm{d}G(T_0)/\mathrm{d}T = 0$ exists in

$$\operatorname{dom} G = \{T ; \operatorname{spec} T \subset \operatorname{dom} f^*\}$$

(f^* is differentiable, being operator convex). Thus the supremum of G is achieved at T_0.

The Frechet derivative $\mathrm{D}f^*(T)$ of f^* i.e., a linear transform in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with

$$\|f^*(T+X) - f^*(T) - \mathrm{D}f^*(T)(X)\|_2 = o(\|X\|_2)$$

is given by, in the basis which diagonalizes T,

$$\mathrm{D}f^*(T)(X) = \left[f^{*[1]}(t_i, t_j) X_{i,j}\right], \tag{23}$$

where t_i $(i = 1, \cdots)$ are eigenvalues of T, and

$$f^{[1]}(t, t') := \begin{cases} \frac{f(t)-f(t')}{t-t'}, & (t \neq t'), \\ f'(t), & (t = t'). \end{cases}$$

A consequence of this formula is $\mathrm{D}f^*(T)(\cdot)$ is self-adjoint with respect to the inner product $\operatorname{tr} XY$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{tr} Y\mathrm{D}f^*(T)(X) &= \sum_{i,j} \overline{\rho_{2,i,j}} f^{*[1]}(t_i, t_j) X_{i,j} \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \overline{f^{*[1]}(t_i, t_j)\rho_{2,i,j}} X_{i,j} \\ &= \operatorname{tr} X\mathrm{D}f^*(T)(Y). \end{aligned}$$

With these definitions and assumptions, we now proceed to the analysis of the maximal point of $G(T)$. Most tractable case is that there is a stationary point of $G(T)$ in $\operatorname{dom} G$. If

$$\begin{aligned} \left.\frac{\mathrm{d}\, G(T_0 + sX)}{\mathrm{d}\, s}\right|_{s=0} &= \operatorname{tr} X\rho_1 - \operatorname{tr}\{\rho_2 \mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(X)\} \\ &= \operatorname{tr} X(\rho_1 - \mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\rho_2)) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

holds for any Hermitian matrix X, T_0 achieves maximum. (Here we used the fact that $\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\cdot)$ is self-conjugate.) Thus, we have

$$\rho_1 = \mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\rho_2) \tag{24}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D_f^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= \operatorname{tr}\rho_1 T_0 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_2 f^*(T_0) \\ &= \operatorname{tr} T_0 \mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\rho_2) - \operatorname{tr}\rho_2 f^*(T_0) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(T_0)\rho_2 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_2 f^*(T_0) \\ &= \operatorname{tr}\{\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(T_0) - f^*(T_0)\}\rho_2 \\ &= \operatorname{tr}\left\{T_0 \cdot f^{*'}(T_0) - f^*(T_0)\right\}\rho_2 \\ &= \operatorname{tr} f\left(f^{*'}(T_0)\right)\rho_2, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here, in the third identity holds since $\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\cdot)$ is self-adjoint, the fifth identity holds due to (23), and the last identity is due to $f = f^{**}$.

Combinig above argument with (15), we have:

Theorem 19 *Suppose f is a proper lower semicontinuous convex function with* $\mathrm{dom}\, f \supset (0,\infty)$. *Suppose also the assumption (I) is true. Then, the T in (20) can be restricted to the set of all the Hermitian operators with* $\mathrm{spec}\, T \subset [t'_*, t_*]$, *$t'_*$ and t_* are as of Definition 12. Also, if $[t'_*, t_*]$ is contained in the interior of* $\mathrm{dom}\, f^*$, *the solution T_0 to (24) exists and achieves the supremum.*

So far, we had supposed the assumption (I) is true. Now let us consider the case where (II) holds and (I) does not. A trivial approach is to exchange ρ_0 and ρ_1, and apply all the analysis replacing f by $\hat{f}$. This means the change of variable from T to $S := -f^*(T)$. But sometimes, the use of the variable T is more preferable for technical reasons. In such cases, still we can use (24), because of the following reason. Since the assumption (II) says that $\hat{f}^*(t) = -f^{*-1}(t)$ is operator convex, it is continuously differentiable. Thus the stable point with respect to S is also a stable point with respect to T.

Remark 20 *The linear map $\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\cdot)$ in fact is completely positive, if f satisfies (I),* $\mathrm{dom}\ f^*$ *is not bounded from below, and $f^*(-\infty) > -\infty$. Since f^* is operator monotone by Lemma 22 below, the matrix $\left[f^{*[1]}(t_i, t_j)\right]_{i,j=1}^n$ is positive for any n and t_1,t_2,$\cdots$,$t_n \in \mathrm{dom}\ f^*$, by Theorem 2.4.3 of [6]. Therefore, there is a complex numbers $\beta_{i,1}$, $\beta_{i,2}$, $\cdots$ with $f^{*[1]}(t_i, t_j) = \sum_\kappa \beta_{i,\kappa}\overline{\beta_{j,\kappa}}$, and thus*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(X) &= \sum_{i,j} f^{*[1]}(t_i, t_j)\,|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|\,X\,|e_j\rangle\langle e_j| \\ &= \sum_\kappa \left(\sum_i \beta_{i,\kappa}\,|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|\right) X \left(\sum_j \overline{\beta_{j,\kappa}}\,|e_j\rangle\langle e_j|\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $T_0 = \sum_i t_i\,|e_i\rangle\langle e_i|$.

Remark 21 *By (24) and (25), $\mathrm{D}f^*(T_0)(\cdot)$ and/or $f^{*'}(T_0)$ may be viewed as a non-commutative version of Radon-Nikodym derivative $\mathrm{d}P_1/\mathrm{d}P_2$.*

8 Non-full-rank states

In this section we study thes case where $\ker \rho_1$ is non-trivial, with the additional assumptions that the condition (I) holds, and $\mathrm{dom}\ f^*$ is not bounded from below. By the following lemma, whose proof is given in Appendix C, f^* in fact is operator monotone increasing.

Lemma 22 *Suppose f is proper, lower semicontinuous, convex, canonical and* $\mathrm{dom}\, f \supset (0,\infty)$. *Suppose also that f^* is operator convex, that* $\mathrm{dom}\ f^*$ *is not bounded from below, and that $f^*(-\infty) > -\infty$. Then f^* is operator monotone.*

Remark 23 dom f^* *is not bounded from below if and only if right derivative of* f *at* $\lambda = 0$ *is* $-\infty$*. In this case* $f^*(-\infty) = f(0)$.

Below, $\pi_{\mathcal{H}'}$ denotes the projection onto $\mathcal{H}'$and π_ρ ($\rho \geq 0$) is short for $\pi_{\mathrm{supp}\,\rho}$. Also, $T_{\mathcal{H}'}$ is the restriction of $\pi_{\mathcal{H}'} T \pi_{\mathcal{H}'}$ on $\mathcal{H}'$.

Lemma 24 *Suppose the domain of a function* h *is unbounded from below and* $h(-\infty)$ *is finite. Then, if* $X \leq 0$,

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} h(T + sX) = h(T_{\ker X})\,\pi_{\ker X} + h(-\infty)\,\pi_{\mathrm{supp}X}. \tag{26}$$

Proof. Let r_s^κ and $|\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle$ ($\||\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle\| = 1$) be the κ-th eigenvalue and eigenvector of $T + sX$, respectively. Since

$$\lim_{s\to\infty} \left(s^{-1}T + X\right) = X,$$

$\lim_{s\to\infty} r_s^\kappa/s := \xi^\kappa$ and $\lim_{s\to\infty} |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle =: |\varphi_\infty^\kappa\rangle$ gives a complete set of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of X. Without loss of generality, let ξ^κ be 0 if $\kappa \leq \dim\ker X$, and negative otherwise.

Let t be an eigenvalue of $T_{\ker X}$ and denote by $\mathcal{H}_t$ and π_t the corresponding eigenspace and the projection onto it. Observe, if $\kappa \leq \dim\ker X$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&r_s^\kappa \pi_t |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle \\
&= \pi_t (T + sX) |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle = \pi_t T |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle \\
&= \pi_t (\pi_{\ker X} + \pi_{\mathrm{supp}X}) T |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle = \pi_t \pi_{\ker X} T |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle \\
&= (\pi_t \pi_{\ker X} T \pi_{\ker X} + \pi_t \pi_{\ker X} T \pi_{\mathrm{supp}X}) |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle \\
&= t\pi_{\mathcal{H}_t} |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle + \pi_{\mathcal{H}_t} T \pi_{\mathrm{supp}X} |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second and the foruth identity is by $\pi_t X = 0$ (recall that $\mathcal{H}_t$ is a subspace of $\ker X$), and the last identity is by $\pi_t T_{\ker X} = t\pi_t$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{s\to\infty} (r_s^\kappa - t)\,\pi_{\mathcal{H}_t} |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle &= \lim_{s\to\infty} \pi_{\mathcal{H}_t} T \pi_{\mathrm{supp}X} |\varphi_s^\kappa\rangle \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if $\pi_{\mathcal{H}_t} |\varphi_\infty^\kappa\rangle \neq 0$ holds, $r_s^\kappa \to t$ holds, implying that $|\varphi_\infty^\kappa\rangle$ is a member of $\mathcal{H}_t$. Since $|\varphi_\infty^\kappa\rangle$ ($\kappa \leq \dim\ker X$) is a member of $\ker X$, which is the direct sum of all $\mathcal{H}_t$'s, it overlaps with, and thus a member of, at least one of $\mathcal{H}_t$'s. Therefore, recalling that $\{|\varphi_\infty^\kappa\rangle\,; \kappa \leq \dim\ker X\}$ is a CONS of $\ker X$,

$$\sum_{\kappa:\lim_{s\to\infty} r_s^\kappa = t} |\varphi_\infty^\kappa\rangle \langle\varphi_\infty^\kappa| = \pi_{\mathcal{H}_t}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{s\to\infty} h\left(T+sX\right)\\
&=\lim_{s\to\infty}\sum_{\kappa\leq\dim\ker X} h\left(r_s^\kappa\right)\left|\varphi_s^\kappa\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_s^\kappa\right| + \lim_{s\to\infty}\sum_{\kappa>\dim\ker X} h\left(r_s^\kappa\right)\left|\varphi_s^\kappa\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_s^\kappa\right|\\
&=\sum_t h\left(t\right)\pi_{\mathcal{H}_t} + \sum_{\kappa>\dim\ker X}\lim_{s\to\infty} h\left(s\xi^\kappa\right)\left|\varphi_\infty^\kappa\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_\infty^\kappa\right|\\
&=h\left(T_{\ker X}\right)\pi_{\ker X} + h\left(-\infty\right)\pi_{\mathrm{supp}X}.
\end{aligned}$$

■

Theorem 25 *Suppose f is proper, lower semicontinuous, convex, canonical and* $\mathrm{dom}\, f \supset (0,\infty)$. *Suppose also f^* is operator convex and* $\mathrm{dom}\ f^*$ *is not bounded from below. Then if ρ_1 is not full-rank,*

$$D_f^{\min}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right) = D_f^{\min}\left(\rho_1||\pi_{\rho_1}\rho_2\pi_{\rho_1}\right) + f\left(0\right)\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_2\left(\mathbf{1}-\pi_{\rho_1}\right). \tag{27}$$

In addition, the measurement achives the maximum is composition of the projective measurement $\{\pi_{\rho_1}, \mathbf{1}-\pi_{\rho_1}\}$ followed by a measurement on $\mathrm{supp}\rho$.

By this theorem, the problem reduces to maximization of $G\left(T\right)$ as of (22) for all T to on the support of ρ_1. Especially, if ρ_1 is rank-1 state, $\rho = \left|\varphi\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi\right|$, and $\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\rho_2\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_f^{\min}\left(\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\,||\rho_2\right) &= \sup_{t\in\mathrm{dom}\, f^*}\left\{t - \left\langle\varphi_1\right|\rho_2\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\ f^*\left(t\right)\right\} + f\left(0\right)\left(1-\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\rho_2\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\right)\\
&= \hat{f}\left(\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\rho_2\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\right) + f\left(0\right)\left(1-\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\rho_2\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

In addition, the measurement achives the maximum is composition of the projective measurement $\left\{\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_1\right|, \mathbf{1}-\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\right\}$.

Proof. By Theorem 13, we only have to prove the assertion for the case $-\infty < f^*\left(-\infty\right)$ (otherwise, $D_f^{\min}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right) = \infty$). By Lemma 22, f^* is operator monotone. Thus, if $X \leq 0$ is supported on $\ker\,\rho_1$, $G\left(T+sX\right)$, where G is as of (22), is non decreasing in s. Therefore,

$$\sup_s G\left(T+sX\right) = \lim_{s\to\infty} G\left(T+sX\right).$$

Hence, by Lemma 24, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{X\leq 0:\,\mathrm{supp}\,X=\ \ker\,\rho_1} G\left(T+X\right) &= \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_1 T_{\mathrm{supp}\rho_1} - \mathrm{tr}\ \left(\rho_2\right)_{\mathrm{supp}\rho_1} f^*\left(T_{\mathrm{supp}\rho_1}\right)\\
&\quad - f^*\left(-\infty\right)\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_2\left(\mathbf{1}-\pi_{\rho_1}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since f is canonical, f is affine on the negative half-line or infinite. If the former is the case, $\mathrm{dom}\, f^*$ is bounded from below. Thus, $\mathrm{dom}\, f$ does not extend to negative half-line. Hence, $f^*\left(-\infty\right) = -f\left(0\right)$. Therefore, we have (27). ■

9 Examples

9.1 Renyi-type, $f_\alpha(\lambda)$

$f_\alpha(\lambda)$ is defined by (1) on the non-negative half line. On the negative half-line, it is canonically extended. We omit the cases of $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$. The relation

$$\hat{f}_\alpha(\lambda) = f_{1-\alpha}(\lambda), \tag{29}$$

turns out to be quite useful.

If $0 < \alpha < 1$,

$$f_\alpha^*(t) = \begin{cases} \infty, & (t > 0), \\ (1-\alpha)\,\alpha^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}(-t)^{\frac{-\alpha}{1-\alpha}}, & (t \le 0). \end{cases}$$

Thus, if $0 < \alpha \le \frac{1}{2}$, the condition (I) satisfied, and if $\frac{1}{2} \le \alpha < 1$, the condition (II) is satisfied. If $\alpha < 0$,

$$f_\alpha^*(t) = \begin{cases} \infty, & (t \ge 0), \\ (\alpha-1)\,(-\alpha)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}(-t)^{\frac{-\alpha}{1-\alpha}}, & (t < 0), \end{cases}$$

and the condition (I) is satisfied. Thus, by (29), the condition (II) is satisfied for $\alpha > 1$. In this case,

$$f_\alpha^*(t) = \begin{cases} (\alpha-1)\,\alpha^{\frac{-\alpha}{\alpha-1}}t^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}, & (t > 0), \\ \infty, & (t \le 0), \end{cases}$$

implying that the condition (I) is also satisfied for $\alpha \ge 2$.

For all the values of α $(\neq 0, 1)$, $f_\alpha^{*\prime}(t)$ moves all over the positive half line $(0, \infty)$. Thus, by Theorem 19, the supremum is achieved by T_0 with (24).

In the case of $\alpha = -1$ and 2, we can solve the problem "explicitly". Observe f_2^* is operator convex on $\mathrm{dom}\, f_2^*$.

$$f_2^*(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{4}t^2, & (t \ge 0), \\ \infty, & (t < 0). \end{cases},$$

By (24), T_0 satisfies Lyapunov equation

$$\mathrm{D}f_2^*(T_0)(\rho_2) = \frac{1}{4}(T_0\rho_2 + \rho_2 T_0) = \rho_1. \tag{30}$$

If $\mathrm{supp}\rho_1 \subset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$, this equation about T_0 has a solution, namely

$$T_0 = 4\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{s\rho_2}\rho_1 e^{s\rho_2}\mathrm{d}s \ge 0,$$

and in the basis where ρ_2 is diagonal,

$$T_{0,i,j} = \frac{4}{\rho_{2,i,i} + \rho_{2,j,j}}\rho_{1,i,j}.$$

Thus, this solution has spectrum in $\operatorname{dom} f_2^*$. By (25),

$$\begin{aligned} D_{f_{-1}}^{\min}(\rho_2||\rho_1) = D_{f_2}^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= \operatorname{tr}\rho_2\left(\frac{1}{2}T_0\right)^2 = \frac{1}{4}\operatorname{tr}\rho_2 T_0^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}\rho_1 T_0 \\ &= 2\operatorname{tr}\rho_1\int_{-\infty}^{0} e^{s\rho_2}\rho_1 e^{s\rho_2}\mathrm{d}s \\ &= 2\sum_{i,j}\frac{1}{\rho_{2,i,i}+\rho_{2,j,j}}\left|\rho_{1,i,j}\right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$f_{\frac{1}{2}}^*(t) = \begin{cases} \infty, & (t>0), \\ -\frac{1}{4}t^{-1}, & (t\le 0), \end{cases}$$

and

$$\mathrm{D}f_{\frac{1}{2}}^*(T_0)(\rho_2) = \frac{1}{4}T_0^{-1}\rho_2 T_0^{-1} = \rho_1. \tag{31}$$

Thus

$$T_0^{-1} = -2\rho_2^{-1/2}\sqrt{\rho_2^{1/2}\rho_1\rho_2^{1/2}}\rho_2^{-1/2},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} D_{f_{1/2}}^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= -\operatorname{tr}\rho_2\left(\frac{1}{4}T_0^{-2}\right)^{1/2} = -\frac{1}{2}\operatorname{tr}\rho_2\left(-T_0^{-1}\right) \\ &= -\operatorname{tr}\sqrt{\rho_2^{1/2}\rho_1\rho_2^{1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

which is -1 times the fidelity of ρ_1 and ρ_2, as expected.

Remark 26 *$\frac{1}{4}T_0$, where T_0 is as of (30), is called 'linear Radon-Nikodym derivative' [12], and $-\frac{1}{2}T_0^{-1}$, where T_0 is as of (31), is 'called quadratic Radon-Nikodym derivative' [11].*

By Theorem 13, $D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2) < \infty$ for any ρ_1 and ρ_2 with $\operatorname{supp}\rho_1 \supset \operatorname{supp}\rho_2$ ($\operatorname{supp}\rho_1 \subset \operatorname{supp}\rho_2$, resp.) if $\alpha < 0$ (if $\alpha > 1$, resp.). If $0 < \alpha < 1$, $D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}(\rho_1||\rho_2)$ is finite for all $\rho_1 \ge 0$ and $\rho_2 \ge 0$.

If $0 < \alpha \le \frac{1}{2}$, f_α^* is operator monotone, and thus by (28),

$$\begin{aligned} D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}(|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|\,||\rho_2) &= \hat{f}_\alpha(\langle\varphi_1|\rho_2|\varphi_1\rangle) - f_\alpha^*(-\infty)(1-\langle\varphi_1|\rho_2|\varphi_1\rangle) \\ &= -\langle\varphi_1|\rho_2|\varphi_1\rangle^{1-\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}(|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|\;||\;|\varphi_2\rangle\langle\varphi_2|) = -|\langle\varphi_1|\varphi_2\rangle|^{2(1-\alpha)}. \tag{32}$$

This means, if $\frac{1}{2} \le \alpha < 1$, using $\hat{f}_\alpha = f_{1-\alpha}$,

$$D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}(|\varphi_1\rangle\langle\varphi_1|\;||\;|\varphi_2\rangle\langle\varphi_2|) = -|\langle\varphi_1|\varphi_2\rangle|^{2\alpha} \tag{33}$$

9.2 On Chernoff and Hoeffding bound

Above mentioned explicit expression ((32) and (33)) of Renyi-type quantity of pure states gives another way to compute celebrated quantum Chernoff bound and Hoeffding bound, whose classical counter part is

$$\begin{aligned} C\left(p_1||p_2\right) &:= \sup \varliminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{-1}{n} \ln\left(\eta_{1,n}+\eta_{2,n}\right) \\ &= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} \left\{-\ln\left(-D_{f_\alpha}\left(p_1||p_2\right)\right)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H_r\left(p_1||p_2\right) &:= \sup\left\{-\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\ln\eta_{1,n};\ \varlimsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\eta_{2,n}\le -r\right\} \\ &= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} -\frac{\alpha r}{1-\alpha} - \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)}\ln\left(-D_{f_\alpha}\left(p_1||p_2\right)\right), \end{aligned}$$

respectively. Here, $\eta_{1,n}$ ($\eta_{2,n}$, resp.) is the probability that the test mistakenly judges the true distribution as being $p_2^{\otimes n}$ ($p_1^{\otimes n}$, respp.), while it is in fact $p_1^{\otimes n}$($p_2^{\otimes n}$, resp.). Their quantum counterparts are, in case that both states are pure,

$$\begin{aligned} C\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right) &= \sup_{0<\alpha<1}\left\{-2\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|\right\} \qquad (34) \\ &= -2\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|, \\ H_r\left(p_1||p_2\right) &= \sup_{0<\alpha<1} -\frac{\alpha r}{1-\alpha} - \frac{2}{(1-\alpha)}\ln\left(\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|\right) \qquad (35) \\ &= \begin{cases} -2\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|, & r\le -2\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|, \\ \infty, & r> -2\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(See [1][4][9].)

We confirm the achievability part of these celebrated results in the case that each ρ_θ ($\theta=1,2$) is a pure state, $|\varphi_\theta\rangle\langle\varphi_\theta|$, using (32) and (33). we have

$$\begin{aligned} C\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right) &\ge \lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_M\sup_{0<\alpha<1}\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\ln\left(-D_{f_\alpha}\left(P^M_{\rho_1^{\otimes n}}||P^M_{\rho_2^{\otimes n}}\right)\right)\right\} \\ &= \lim_{n\to\infty}\sup_{0<\alpha<1}\sup_M\left\{-\frac{1}{n}\ln\left(-D_{f_\alpha}\left(P^M_{\rho_1^{\otimes n}}||P^M_{\rho_2^{\otimes n}}\right)\right)\right\} \\ &= \max\left\{\sup_{0<\alpha\le\frac{1}{2}} -2\left(1-\alpha\right)\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|,\ \sup_{\frac{1}{2}<\alpha<1} -2\alpha\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|\right\} \qquad (36) \\ &= -2\ln\left|\langle\varphi_1\ |\varphi_2\rangle\right|, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H_r\left(p_1||p_2\right) \\
&\geq \max\left\{\sup_{0<\alpha\leq\frac{1}{2}} -\frac{\alpha r}{1-\alpha} - 2\ln\left|\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\left.\varphi_2\right\rangle\right|, \sup_{\frac{1}{2}<\alpha<1} -\frac{\alpha r}{1-\alpha} - \frac{2\alpha}{1-\alpha}\ln\left|\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\left.\varphi_2\right\rangle\right|\right\} \qquad (37)\\
&= \begin{cases} -2\ln\left|\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\left.\varphi_2\right\rangle\right|, & r\leq -2\ln\left|\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\left.\varphi_2\right\rangle\right|, \\ \infty, & r> -2\ln\left|\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\left.\varphi_2\right\rangle\right|. \end{cases}.
\end{aligned}
$$

These confirms known results. Interestingly, even though (34), (35) and (36), (37) give the same supremum, they differ at almost all the values of α.

9.3 Comparison with asymptotic optimum

There had been a series of achievements on the asymptotic optimization of D_{f_α}. Summarizing their results (with some simple considerations),

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\left|D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)\right| = \begin{cases} \log\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\rho_1\rho_2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}\right)^{\alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha\geq\frac{1}{2}, \alpha\neq 1, \\ \log\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}}\rho_2\rho_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}}\right)^{1-\alpha}, & \text{if } \alpha\leq\frac{1}{2}, \alpha\neq 0, \end{cases}
$$

holds whenever the LHS is finite (see [3][5][8], a brief review of them is given in Appendix D).

When $\alpha\leq 1/2$ and $\rho_1=\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\left\langle\varphi_1\right|$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}}\rho_2\rho_1^{\frac{\alpha}{2(1-\alpha)}}\right)^{1-\alpha} &= \log\mathrm{tr}\left(\left\langle\varphi_1\right|\rho_2\left|\varphi_1\right\rangle\right)^{1-\alpha} \\
&= \log\left|D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right)\right|,
\end{aligned}
$$

so asymptotic optimal equals singe copy optimal.

When $\alpha=2$ and $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1=\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$, the asymptotic optimal is larger than or equal to the single copy optimal:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log\mathrm{tr}\left(\rho_2^{-1/2}\rho_1\rho_2^{-1/2}\right)\rho_1 &= \log\sum_{i,j}\left|\rho_{1,i,j}\right|^2\left(\rho_{2,ii}\rho_{2,jj}\right)^{-1/2} \\
&\geq \log\sum_{i,j}\frac{2}{\rho_{2,i,i}+\rho_{2,j,j}}\left|\rho_{1,i,j}\right|^2 \\
&= \log\left|D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right)\right| = \log\mathrm{tr}\left(\frac{1}{2}T_0\rho_1\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the identity holds only if $\rho_{2,i,i}=\rho_{2,j,j}$ for all i and j with $\left|\rho_{1,i,j}\right|\neq 0$, or equivallently, only if ρ_2 commutes with ρ_1.

It is shown that an asymptotically optimal measurement sequence is projection onto eigenspaces of $\rho_2^{\otimes n}$[3][5][8]. The key or the proof is the inequality

$$
A\leq v^n\mathcal{E}^n\left(A\right),
$$

where $A \geq 0$ is arbitrary, $\mathcal{E}^n$ is the pinching operation corresponding to the above mentioned asymptotically optimal measurement, and v^n is a number of distinct eigenvalues of $\rho_2^{\otimes n}$.

When $\alpha > 1$, we can check this $\mathcal{E}^n$ gives asymptotically optimal measurement using (13).

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n}\log D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right) &= \frac{1}{n}\log\sup_M \sum_{t\in\operatorname{supp} M\subset[0,\infty)} \left\{t\operatorname{tr}\rho_1^{\otimes n}M_t - f_\alpha^*(t)\operatorname{tr}\rho_2^{\otimes n}M_t\right\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n}\log\sup_M \sum_{t\in\operatorname{supp} M\subset[0,\infty)} \left\{t\operatorname{tr} v^n\mathcal{E}^n\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}\right)M_t - f_\alpha^*(t)\operatorname{tr}\rho_2^{\otimes n}M_t\right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{tr}\left\{v^n\mathcal{E}^n\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}\right)\right\}^\alpha\left(\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)^{1-\alpha} \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{tr}\left\{\mathcal{E}^n\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}\right)\right\}^\alpha\left(\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)^{1-\alpha} + \frac{\alpha}{n}\log v^n,
\end{aligned}$$

where the identity in the third line holds since $\mathcal{E}^n\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}\right)$ commutes with $\rho_2^{\otimes n}$. On the other hand, it is obvious

$$\frac{1}{n}\log D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right) \geq \frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{tr}\left\{\mathcal{E}^n\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}\right)\right\}^\alpha\left(\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)^{1-\alpha}.$$

Thus, since v^n is polynomial in n, we have that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right) = \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\operatorname{tr}\left\{\mathcal{E}^n\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}\right)\right\}^\alpha\left(\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)^{1-\alpha},$$

and the assertion is checked.

9.4 Kullback-Leibler divergence

Define $f_{\mathrm{KL}}(\lambda) := \lambda\ln\lambda$ $(\lambda \geq 0)$ and $f_{\mathrm{KL}}(\lambda) := \infty$ $(\lambda < 0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{f_{\mathrm{KL}}}(p_1||p_2) &= D_{\hat{f}_{\mathrm{KL}}}(p_2||p_1) \\
&= \begin{cases} \int p_1(x)\ln\frac{p_1(x)}{p_2(x)}\mathrm{d}\mu(x), & \text{if } \operatorname{supp} p_1 \subset \operatorname{supp} p_2, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

is the Kullback-Leibler divergence.

As easily seen,

$$f_{\mathrm{KL}}^*(t) = e^{t-1}$$

is not operator convex but

$$\hat{f}_{\mathrm{KL}}^*(t) = \begin{cases} -1-\ln(-t), & (t<0), \\ \infty, & (t\geq 0), \end{cases}$$

is operator convex. Both of

$$\mathrm{D}f^*_{\mathrm{KL}}(T_0)(\rho_2) = \int_0^1 e^{sT_0}\rho_2 e^{(1-s)T_0}\mathrm{d}s = \rho_1,$$
$$\mathrm{D}\hat{f}^*_{\mathrm{KL}}(S_0)(\rho_1) = \int_0^\infty (s\mathbf{1}-S_0)^{-1}\rho_1(s\mathbf{1}-S_0)^{-1}\mathrm{d}s = \rho_2$$

are difficult to solve. But using these solutions,

$$\begin{aligned} D^{\min}_{f_{\mathrm{KL}}}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_2 T_0' \ln T_0' \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_1 \ln S_0', \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T_0' := e^{T_0-1}, S_0' = -S_0.$$

Also, applying Theorem 13, $D^{\min}_{f_{\mathrm{KL}}}(\rho_1||\rho_2)$ is finite only if $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2 \supset \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1$.

9.5 Total variation distance

Total variation distance $\|\rho_1-\rho_2\|_1$ equals, as is well known, $D^{\min}_{f_{\mathrm{TV}}}$, where $f_{\mathrm{TV}}(\lambda) := |1-\lambda|$.

$$f^*_{\mathrm{TV}}(t) = \begin{cases} \lambda, & \text{if } -1 \le \lambda \le 1, \\ \infty, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We confirm this result using our method. Here, it is important to choose f which is canonical. Observe f^*_{TV} is operator convex on $\mathrm{dom}\, f^*_{\mathrm{TV}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} D^{\min}_{f_{\mathrm{TV}}}(\rho_1||\rho_2) &= \sup_{T:-\mathbf{1}\le \mathrm{spec}\,T\le \mathbf{1}} \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_1 T - \mathrm{tr}\,\rho_2 T \\ &= \|\rho_1-\rho_2\|_1 . \end{aligned}$$

Note that $t_* = 1$ and $t_*' = -1$ does not satisfy the premise of Theorem 19. Indeed, the supremum is achieved by a T whose eigenvalues are at the both end of the domain of f^*_{TV}.

10 Quantum Fisher information

First, we present the problem rather in informal manner, before rigorous presentation. Consider a parameterized family $\{p_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$ of probability density functions over a finite set, and suppose $\eta \to p_\eta$ is smooth, and $\mathrm{supp}\,p_\eta \subset \mathrm{supp}\,p_0$. Suppose also f is a convex function with all good features. Then using Taylor expansion of f,

$$\lim_{\eta'\to\eta} \frac{1}{(\eta-\eta')^2}\left(D_f(p_\eta||p_{\eta'}) - D_f(p_\eta||p_\eta)\right) = \frac{1}{2}f''(1)\,J_\eta \tag{38}$$

where

$$J_\eta := \sum_x \frac{(\mathrm{d}p_\eta(x)/\mathrm{d}\eta)^2}{p_\eta(x)}$$

is the Fisher information of the family $\{p_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$, which characterizes asymptotic behavior of optimal estimate of η. The above mentioned relation is a key in the analysis of large deviation type analysis of estimates, and in understunding its relation to asymptotic behaviour of optimal hypothesis test.Thus exploring its quantum analogue is also of interest.

Let $\{\rho_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$ be a family of density operators, and suppose $\eta\to\rho_\eta$ is smooth. Then our task here is to evaluate $D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta'})$ up to $O(\eta-\eta')^2$. Naively exchanging the order of limit and optimization, we have

$$\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{(\eta-\eta')^2}\left(D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta'})-D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_\eta)\right)=\frac{1}{2}f''(1)\,J_\eta^S. \tag{39}$$

where

$$J_\eta^S:=\max_M J_\eta^M$$

and J_η^M is the Fisher information of the family $\left\{p_\eta^M\right\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$, and $p_\eta^M:=\mathrm{tr}\ \rho_\eta M_x$. J_η^S , *SLD Fisher information*, is given by

$$J_\eta^S:=\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\eta\left(L_\eta^S\right)^2,$$

where L_η^S, the *symmetric logarithmic derivative* (*SLD*, for short) of $\{\rho_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$, is defined as a Hermitian operator satisfying the equation

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}\rho_\eta}{\mathrm{d}\eta}=\frac{1}{2}\left(L_\eta^S\rho_\eta+\rho_\eta L_\eta^S\right).$$

SLD Fisher information, as its classical analogue, nicely characterize the asymptotic behavior of the optimal estimate of the unknown parameter η.

If all members of $\{\rho_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$ have a common support, it is not difficult to make the above argument rigorous. If each ρ_η differs in its support, however, the remainder term of the Taylor expansion is not necessarily bounded due to $1/p_\eta^M$ -factors. For example, if ρ_η's ($\eta\in\mathbb{R}$) are pure states, $D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}$ ($\alpha>1,\alpha<0$), $D_{f_{\mathrm{KL}}}^{\min}$ and $D_{f_{\mathrm{KL}_2}}^{\min}$ diverge, and (39) is never true. On the other hand, in the case that $f^*(-\infty)$ is finite, $f=f_\alpha$ ($0<\alpha\le 1/2$) for example, it is easy to see the LHS of (39) equals constant multiple of J_η^S. Hence, the above naive argument is not completely false, though it is not rigorous. Below, we give deeper analysis on this issue. As it will turn out, (39) requires some non-trivial correction, when the rank of ρ_η is neither full nor 1.

Having outlined the problem roughly, we specify all the conditions for the argument rigorously. f is supposed to be proper, convex, lower semi-continuous, three times continuously differentiable in the neighborhood of 1, and

$$f''(1)>0.$$

(All these are often assumed to derive (38). Especially, the last assumption is necessary for the f-divergence not to be constant at $\eta\approx\eta'$.) Also, we need additional condtions to use Theorem 25: we suppose the assumption (I) holds and $\mathrm{dom}\,f^*$ is unbounded from below. We also suppose that the map $\eta\to\rho_\eta$ is three times continuously differentiable,and the rank of ρ_η does not vary with η.

Theorem 27 *On above mentioned conditions,*

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{(\eta'-\eta)^2}\left(D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta'})-D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_\eta)\right)\\&=\frac{f''(1)}{2}\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\eta\left(L_\eta^{S,1}\right)^2+\frac{1}{4}\left(f'(1)-f(1)+f(0)\right)\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\eta'}\left(L_\eta^{S,2}\right)^2,\end{aligned}\tag{40}$$

where

$$L_\eta^{S,1}:=\pi_{\rho_\eta}L_\eta^S\pi_{\rho_\eta},\ L_\eta^{S,2}:=(\mathbf{1}-\pi_{\rho_\eta})L_\eta^S\,\pi_{\rho_\eta}.$$

If ρ_η is full rank (in this case, $L_\eta^{S,2}=0$) or pure (in this case $L_\eta^{S,1}=0$) the LHS of (40) equals a constant multiple of J_η^S , though each case differs in the value of the constant. But if the rank of ρ_η is not full nor 1, the result is a weighted sum of two components of the SLD Fisher information; one is concerned with the change on the support of ρ_η and the other is concerned with the change on the kernel of ρ_η.

For example, consider $D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}$ $(0<\alpha<\frac{1}{2})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{(\eta'-\eta)^2}\left(D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta'})-D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_\eta)\right)\\&=\frac{(1-\alpha)\,\alpha}{2}\left\{\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\eta\left(L_\eta^{S,1}\right)^2+\frac{1}{2\alpha}\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_\eta\left(L_\eta^{S,2}\right)^2\right\}.\end{aligned}$$

If $\alpha=\frac{1}{2}$, which corresponds to fidelity, this equals a constant multiple of J_η^S. Otherwise, this gives a monotone Riemannian metric larger than a constant multiple of J_η^S.

Proof. To prove (40), by Theorem 25, we only have to compute $D_f^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta',1})$ and $1-\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\eta',1}$ up to $O(\eta-\eta')^2$, where

$$\rho_{\eta',1}:=\pi_{\rho_\eta}\rho_{\eta'}\pi_{\rho_\eta}$$

Let $c_{\eta'}$ be a non-positive number with

$$|\rho_{\eta',1}-\rho_\eta|-c_{\eta'}\rho_\eta\le 0,$$

where $|A|:=\sqrt{A^\dagger A}$. Suppose η' is enough close to η. Then $\pi_\eta\rho_{\eta'}\pi_\eta\approx\rho_\eta$, and thus $\pi_\eta\rho_{\eta'}\pi_\eta$ is full-rank on $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_\eta$. Therefore, $c_{\eta'}$ exists and

$$c_{\eta'}\le\frac{\|\rho_{\eta',1}-\rho_\eta\|_1}{r_0/2}=O(\eta-\eta'),$$

where r_0 is the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of ρ_η. Therefore, for any $M_t\ge 0$,

$$\frac{|\mathrm{tr}\ (\rho_{\eta',1}-\rho_\eta)\,M_t|}{\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\eta',1}M_t}\le\frac{\mathrm{tr}\ |\rho_{\eta',1}-\rho_\eta|\ M_t}{\mathrm{tr}\,\rho_{\eta',1}M_t}\le c_{\eta'}.$$

Therefore, using Taylor's expansion of f up to the third order, we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&D_f\left(P^M_{\rho_\eta}||P^M_{\rho_{\eta',1}}\right)\\
&=\sum_{t\in\operatorname{supp}M} f\left(\frac{\operatorname{tr}\left(\rho_\eta-\rho_{\eta',1}\right)M_t}{\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}M_t}+1\right)\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}M_t\\
&=f(1)\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}+f'(1)\left(1-\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}\right)+\frac{1}{2}f''(1)\sum_{t\in\operatorname{supp}M}\frac{\left(\operatorname{tr}\left(\rho_\eta-\rho_{\eta',1}\right)M_t\right)^2}{\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}M_t}+R,
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
|R|\le\frac{1}{6}\sup_{\lambda_0\in\left[1-c_{\eta'},1+c_{\eta'}\right]}\left|f'''(\lambda_0)\right|c_{\eta'}^3=O\left(\eta'-\eta\right)^3. \tag{41}
$$

Since the RHS of (41) is independent of the measurement M,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{\left(\eta-\eta'\right)^2}\left\{D_f^{\min}\left(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta',1}\right)-D_f^{\min}\left(\rho_\eta||\rho_\eta\right)\right\}\\
&=\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{\left(\eta-\eta'\right)^2}\left\{D_f^{\min}\left(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta',1}\right)-f(1)\right\}\\
&=\frac{1}{2}f''(1)\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{\left(\eta-\eta'\right)^2}D_{f_b}^{\min}\left(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta',1}\right)\\
&+\left(f'(1)-f(1)\right)\lim_{\eta'\to\eta}\frac{1}{\left(\eta-\eta'\right)^2}\left(1-\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
f_b(\lambda):=\begin{cases}(\lambda-1)^2, & \text{if } \lambda\ge 0,\\ -2\lambda, & \text{if } \lambda<0.\end{cases}
$$

Thus we only have to compute $D_{f_b}^{\min}$ and $1-\operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}$ up to $O\left(\eta-\eta'\right)^2$.

$D_{f_b}^{\min}$ is computed almost in parallel manner with $D_{f_2}^{\min}$. Since

$$
f_b^*(t)=\begin{cases}\frac{1}{4}t^2+t, & \text{if } t\ge -1/2,\\ \infty, & \text{if } t<-1/2\end{cases}
$$

is operator convex on $\operatorname{dom}f_b^*$, by (24), using a solution T_0 to the follwoing Lyapunov equation,

$$
\rho_\eta-\rho_{\eta',1}=\frac{1}{4}\left(T_0\rho_{\eta',1}+\rho_{\eta',1}T_0\right), \tag{42}
$$

we have

$$
D_{f_b}^{\min}\left(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta',1}\right)=\operatorname{tr}\left(\frac{1}{2}T_0+\mathbf{1}-\mathbf{1}\right)^2\rho_{\eta',1}=\operatorname{tr}\left(\frac{1}{2}T_0\right)^2\rho_{\eta',1}. \tag{43}
$$

Here, that (42) has a solution is checked by Theorem 19 and the fact that $\operatorname{dom}f_b^*=[-\frac{1}{2},\infty)$. Alternatively, the solution T_0 can be explicitly constructed almost parallel manner as in the case of f_2.

Since its rank does not vary with η, ρ_η can be written as $\rho_\eta = A_\eta A_\eta^\dagger$, and the curve $\{A_\eta\}_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies

$$A_{\eta'} = A_\eta + \frac{1}{2}(\eta' - \eta) L_\eta^S A_\eta + C_1 \tag{44}$$

for some $C_1 = O(\eta' - \eta)^2$. By (42) and (44), we have

$$\frac{1}{2}T_0 = -(\eta' - \eta) L_\eta^{S,1} + C_2,$$

where C_2 is $O(\eta' - \eta)^2$. Inserting this into (43), $D_{f_b}^{\min}(\rho_\eta||\rho_{\eta',1})$ is computed up to $O(\eta' - \eta)^2$.

On the other hand, $1 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1}$ is computed as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \operatorname{tr}\rho_{\eta',1} &= \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{1} - \pi_{\rho_\eta})\rho_{\eta'}(\mathbf{1} - \pi_{\rho_\eta}) \\
&= \operatorname{tr}(\mathbf{1} - \pi_{\rho_\eta})\left(\frac{1}{2}L_\eta^S A_\eta(\eta' - \eta) + C_1\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}L_\eta^S A_\eta(\eta' - \eta) + C_1\right)^\dagger(\mathbf{1} - \pi_{\rho_\eta}) \\
&= \operatorname{tr}\left(\frac{1}{2}L_\eta^{S,2} A_\eta(\eta' - \eta) + (\mathbf{1} - \pi_{\rho_\eta})C_1\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}L_\eta^{S,2} A_\eta(\eta' - \eta) + (\mathbf{1} - \pi_{\rho_\eta})C_1\right)^\dagger \\
&= \frac{1}{4}(\eta' - \eta)^2 \operatorname{tr} L_\eta^{S,2}\rho_\eta L_\eta^{S,2} + O(\eta' - \eta)^3.
\end{aligned}$$

After all, we have (40). ■

11 Summary and questions

Using tools from convex analysis and matrix analysis, the maximization of the measured f-divergence is rewritten to a simpler form (20) on the assumption that (I) or (II) holds, and derived and proved some closed formulas and properties of $D_f^{\min}$. Some questions are in order. First, what is the necessary and sufficient condition of f such that (20) holds? Second, the condition (I) is written in terms of f^*, but it would be nicer to have some alternative condition written in terms of f itself, since in the study of other versions of quantum f-divergence, they often assume f to be operator convex (and not f^*). Third, it is easy to obtain a lower bound to $D_f^{\min}$ by (20), but is there any good upper bound to the quantity, which is useful for the study of asymptotic theory?

References

[1] K.M.R. Audenaert, J. Calsamiglia, Ll. Masanes, R. Munoz-Tapia, A. Acin, E. Bagan, F. Verstraete, " Discriminating states: the quantum Chernoff bound," Physics Review Letters 98 160501, (2007)

[2] R. Bahatia, Matrix Analysis, Springer, (1997)

[3] R. L. Frank and E. H. Lieb: Monotonicity of a relative Renyi entropy; J. Math. Phys 54, 122201, (2013)

[4] F. Hiai, M. Mosonyi, D. Petz and C. Beny, "Quantum f-divergences and error corrections," Reviews in Mathematical Physics, 23, 691–747 (2011)

[5] M. Hayashi, M. Tomamichel, "Correlation detection and an Operational Interpretation of the Renyi Mutual Information," arXiv:1408.6894 (2014)

[6] F. Hiai, "Matrix Analysis: Matrix Monotone Functions, Matrix Means, and Majorization," GSIS selected lectures, Interdisciplinary Information Sciences 16, 139–248 (2010)

[7] F. Hiai, D. Petz, "The proper formula for relative entropy and its asymptotics in quantum probability," Comm. Math. Phys. 143, 99–114 (1991)

[8] M. Mosonyi, T. Ogawa, "Quantum hypothesis testing and the operational interpretation of the quantum Renyi relative entropies," Communications in Mathematical Physics: Volume 334, Issue 3 pp.1617-1648 (2015).

[9] H. Nagaoka, "The converse part of the theorem for quantum Hoeffding bound," quant-ph/0611289 .

[10] R. Rockafellar, Convex analysis (Princeton, 1970).

[11] S. Sakai, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 71, 149-151 (1965).

[12] S. Sakai, C*-algebras and W*-algebras, Springer Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York (1971).

[13] H. Strasser, "Mathematical Theory of Statistics", de Gruyter (1985).

[14] E. Torgersen, "Comparison of Statistical Experiments", Cambridge University Press (1991).

[15] D. Luenberger, Optimization by vector space method (Wiley, 1969).

A The proof of (5), (6), and (7)

To see that f_0 and f coincide on the positive half-line, observe that f^* is monotone non-increasing in the region below $\operatorname{dom} f_0^*$. Therefore, in that region, $t \to t\lambda - f^*(t)$ is monotone non-decreasing if $\lambda \geq 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda) &= \sup_{t \in \operatorname{dom} f_0^*} t\lambda - f^*(t) \\ &= \sup_{t \in \operatorname{dom} f_0^*} t\lambda - f_0^*(t) \\ &= f_0(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\lambda < 0$. Then in taking supremum of $t\lambda - f_0^*(t)$, the range of t can be limitted to $\operatorname{dom} f_0^*$. Also, $t\lambda - f_0^*(t)$ is monotone decreasing on $\operatorname{dom} f_0^*$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f_0(\lambda) &= \sup_{t \in \operatorname{dom} f_0^*} t\lambda - f_0^*(t) \\ &= t_0\lambda - f_0^*(t_0) \\ &= t_0\lambda + f(0), \end{aligned}$$

where the third equality is by (8).

Thus it remains to show (7) in the $t_0 > -\infty$- case. To show this, suppose the contrary is true. Since f_0 is convex, $t_0 < f'_+(0)$. Here note $f'_+(0)$ is finite since and f is finite at some point on the positive half line. Let t be a real number between t_0 and $f'_+(0)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f_0^*(t) &= \max\left\{\sup_{\lambda>0}(t\lambda - f(\lambda)), \sup_{\lambda\leq 0}(t\lambda - (\lambda t_0 + f(0)))\right\} \\ &\leq \max\left\{\sup_{\lambda>0}\left(\left(t - f'_+(0)\right)\lambda - f(0)\right), \sup_{\lambda\leq 0}((t-t_0)\lambda - f(0))\right\} \\ &= -f(0) = f^*(t_0) = f_0^*(t_0). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts with the requirement that f_0^* should be strictly monotone increasing in its effective domain. Thus we should have (7).

B The proof of Theorem 14

By (11) and Theorem 13, obviously these conditions are necessary for D_f^Q to be finite. Thus, we show the conditions are sufficient.

Suppose $\operatorname{supp}\rho_1 \subset \operatorname{supp}\rho_2$. Then there is a number $\lambda \in [0,1]$ and ρ_3 with $\rho_2 = \lambda\rho_1 + (1-\lambda)\rho_3$. Define P_θ on the set $\{+,-\}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &P_1(+) := 1, P_1(-) := 0, \\ &P_2(+) := \lambda, P_2(-) := 1-\lambda. \end{aligned}$$

Also, define a CPTP map Λ by $\Lambda(\delta_+) := \rho_1$ and $\Lambda(\delta_-) := \rho_3$. Then $\Lambda(P_\theta) = \rho_\theta$ and $\operatorname{supp}P_1 \subset \operatorname{supp}P_2$. Thus if (16) holds,

$$D_f^Q(\rho_1||\rho_2) \leq D_f(P_1||P_2) < \infty.$$

Almost parallely, If $\operatorname{supp}\rho_2 \subset \operatorname{supp}\rho_1$, (17) implies $D_f^{\max}(\rho_1||\rho_2) < \infty$.

Finally, if (18) holds, for any P_θ, $D_f(P_1||P_2) < \infty$. Let $P_1 := \delta_+$ and $P_2 := \delta_-$. Then, Also, $\Lambda(P_\theta) = \rho_\theta$ holds with $\Lambda(\delta_+) := \rho_1$ and $\Lambda(\delta_-) := \rho_2$. Therefore, $D_f^Q(\rho_1||\rho_2) \leq D_f(P_1||P_2) < \infty$, and the proof is complete.

C The proof of Lemma 22

First we show $\mathrm{dom}\, f^* = (-\infty, a)$ or $(-\infty, a]$. Suppose the contrary, or equivallently, $\mathrm{dom}\, f^*$ is the whole real line. Since f^* is operator convex, it is quadratic. Then, since f is canonical, or equivallently f^* is monotone increasing, $f^*(-\infty) = -\infty$, contradicting $f^*(-\infty) > -\infty$. Thus the assertion holds.

Suppose $\mathrm{dom}\, f^* = (-\infty, a]$. Then, $h(t) := f^*(-t+a)$ is finite on $[0,\infty)$ and monotone non-increasing. Also, $h(\infty) > -\infty$. Since h is monotone non-increasing and proper, $h(\infty) < \infty$, and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{h(t)}{t} = 0.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 8.4 of [4], h can be written as

$$h(t) = h(0) + \alpha t - \int_{(0,\infty)} \frac{t}{t+\eta} \mathrm{d}\nu(\eta)$$

using a non-negative measure ν with $\int_{(0,\infty)} \frac{1}{1+\eta} \mathrm{d}\nu(\eta) < \infty$. Since

$$\alpha = \frac{h(t) - h(0)}{t} + \int_{(0,\infty)} \frac{1}{t+\eta} \mathrm{d}\nu(\eta)$$

and

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \int_{(0,\infty)} \frac{1}{t+\eta} \mathrm{d}\nu(\eta) = 0$$

by Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem, we have $\alpha = 0$. Since for each η the function $t \to -t/(t+\eta)$ is oprator monotone decreasing, $h(t)$ is operator monotone decreasing, implying the assertion.

If $\mathrm{dom}\, f^* = (-\infty, a)$, due to the above argument, f^* is operator monotone increasing on $(-\infty, a-\varepsilon]$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose the spectrum of A_1 and A_2 is a subset of $(-\infty, a]$, and $A_1 \geq A_2$. Then since $A_1 - \varepsilon \mathbf{1} \geq A_2 - \varepsilon \mathbf{1}$,

$$f^*(A_1 - \varepsilon \mathbf{1}) \geq f^*(A_2 - \varepsilon \mathbf{1}).$$

Letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have $f^*(A_1) \geq f^*(A_2)$, meaning that f^* is operator monotone increasing on $(-\infty, a)$.

D Maximization of asymptotic measured relative Renyi entropy

This appendix is a brief review of [8] and [5]. When $\mathrm{supp}\, \rho_1 = \mathrm{supp}\, \rho_2$, we define

$$\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}(\rho_1 || \rho_2) := \mathrm{sign}((1-\alpha)\alpha) \cdot \mathrm{tr} \left(\rho_2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \rho_1 \rho_2^{\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} \right)^\alpha. \tag{45}$$

$\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}$ is extended to the case of $\mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 \neq \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2$ so that the function is lower semicontinuous. Namely, we define

$$\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right) := \infty, \tag{46}$$

for some value of α : we adopt (46) for the interval $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$ if $\ker\rho_2 \cap \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 \neq \{0\}$, and for the interval $\alpha \in (-\infty, 0)$, if $\ker\rho_1 \cap \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_2 \neq \{0\}$: for the interval $\alpha \in (0,1)$, we always adopt (45).

Suppose $\alpha \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1) \cup (1,\infty)$. In this case, by [3], $\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}$ is monotone non-increasing by CPTP maps, or

$$\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right) \geq \tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}\left(\Lambda\left(\rho_1\right)||\Lambda\left(\rho_2\right)\right)$$

for any CPTP map Λ. Also, obviously additivity

$$\log\left|\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)\right| = n\log\left|\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right)\right|$$

holds and restriction to commutative states equals D_{f_α}. Thus, $\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}$ is an upper bound to asymptotic optimal,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n}\log\left|D_{f_\alpha}^{\min}\left(\rho_1^{\otimes n}||\rho_2^{\otimes n}\right)\right| \leq \log\left|\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}\left(\rho_1||\rho_2\right)\right|.$$

The achievability part is shown by [8] ($\alpha > 1$) and [5] ($\alpha \in (0,1)\cup(1,\infty)$).

When $\alpha \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (0, \frac{1}{2}]$, we only have to exploit the fact $D_{f_\alpha}\left(P_1||P_2\right) = D_{f_{1-\alpha}}\left(P_2||P_1\right)$.

Remark 28 *In Remark III.5 of [8], they state that the monotonicity of $\tilde{D}_{f_\alpha}$ ($\alpha > 1$) by CPTP maps is not true for the states with* $\ker\rho_2 \cap \mathrm{supp}\,\rho_1 \neq \{0\}$. *We had avoided this problem by using the definition (46).*

E